1989

The FIPSE-CSULB Mentoring Project for New Faculty

Robert Boice

Jimmie L. Turner

The FIPSE-CSULB Mentoring Project for New Faculty

Robert Boice

State University of New York at Stonybrook

Jimmie L. Turner

California State University, Long Beach

Impetus for a formal mentoring project on our campus came from three years of interviews with newly hired faculty members (Turner & Boice, 1987). What we learned was simple but disturbing: most of our new faculty felt collegially isolated and understimulated.

Confirmation that our new hires needed more collegial support and stimulation came in a related observation. The minority of new faculty members who had found effective mentors presented the most positive profiles: they evidenced higher job satisfaction, better teaching ratings, more productive scholarship, and the most certain plans for remaining at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB).

As we realized that we needed to provide mentors for other new faculty members, we also wondered where to start. Fortunately, our first glance at the literature about new faculty proved comforting; we found a number of predictions that regional campuses would experience problems with new faculty. For example, analyses of academic trends suggest that increasing emphases on research and publication will have the greatest impact at "second level" state universities where teaching loads remain heavy (Austin & Gamson, 1983; Schuster & Bowen, 1985).

The literature on mentoring, however, provided little of prescriptive value. Much of it seemed to tell us what we already knew—that faculty often fail to be as generous in sharing with colleagues as we might like

(Brookes & German, 1983), and that first-year faculty members experience a sense of overwhelming pressure to master teaching as well as pervasive feelings of panic and isolation (Kolbert, 1987). When we checked with other campuses about the commonality of mentoring for new faculty, we confirmed another suspicion. Evidently, mentors who fit Levinson's (1978) classic descriptions of coaches and guides who support, advise, and challenge are uncommon on campuses, especially for non-traditional newcomers like women and minorities (Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987).

Further excursions into the literature and lore of mentoring produced three specific, discouraging facts: first, formal programs for mentoring new faculty members share a typical failing of faculty development – they tend to reach only those faculty least in need of help (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). Second, mentor-protegé pairs established during formal mentoring programs for new faculty rarely persisted in meeting, even when the programs were generously funded by federal agencies (Wylie, 1985). Third, prior studies of mentoring for new faculty produced no empirically-based advice on what mentors should do or on how mentors should be matched with protegés (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newman, 1984).

We began, then, with resolutions to match our program to the needs of new faculty on our campus, to measure what happened, and to observe what worked in our mentoring pairs. Where other reports of establishing mentoring emphasized the practical aspects of setting up programs (e.g., providing descriptions of orientation meetings for mentors and mentees), we would add a second focus: on process. Where other projects seemed content simply to pair people, we would push to ensure that the pairs kept interacting. Where other programs followed traditional norms of letting senior and new faculty pick each other, usually from within the same academic departments, we would match people across the usual boundaries of discipline or gender. And, where most programs relied on self-reports of satisfaction to assess their effectiveness, we would look for specific behavioral indices of success and failure.

After a year of pilot work that seemed to confirm the practicality of our ideas, we received funding from a federal agency (FIPSE). These funds provided incentives for mentors who agreed to frequent meetings with protegés and to regular record-keeping and interactions with us.

Methods

Subjects

We started our formal project with a deliberately small sample of 14 pairs of mentors and protegés in project year one. The small size of the group allowed us, as project directors, to meet routinely (weekly or biweekly) with and observe the 28 participants.

Before pairing new faculty with mentors, we solicited suggestions for mentors and mentees from deans and chairs. In establishing pairs, we combined those suggestions with other criteria: we picked mentors on the basis of our observations of their prowess and balance as teachers, researchers, and colleagues; and we picked mentees (from a group of about 30 new hires) on the basis of our judgments about their need for mentoring and their willingness, eventually, to become mentors themselves.

We paired the mentees and mentors selected from the pool just mentioned with two considerations in mind. We used subjective judgements about the compatibility of the people to be paired. And we followed constraints for stratifying our study group according to rules in which approximately half the pairs had: a) a mentor with either clear seniority of ten years or more on campus or else limited seniority of only one to three years; b) a mentor of the opposite sex from the protegé; c) a mentor or mentee from an ethnic or minority group; and d) a mentor from a different department or school/college than the mentee's.

Before pairs entered the project formally, they met over lunch to judge their compatibility. In only one of 14 meetings did this lead to dissolution (the mentee claimed she had discovered she would be too busy to participate); the widowed mentor was then successfully paired with another mentee.

Our reasons for pairing mentors and mentees across traditional boundaries went beyond a curiosity about practicality. On a campus where many senior faculty might not have been appropriate mentors for new faculty faced with pressures to excel at both teaching and research, we turned to relatively junior faculty as an additional source of mentors. And on a campus where proportionately more new faculty were women and minorities, we looked beyond their immediate departments for mentoring sources.

Although we paired faculty (given the constraints just mentioned) somewhat intuitively, the agency funding our project insisted that we gather data about the usefulness of personality measures in predicting the compatibility of pairs. FIPSE personnel and reviewers designated the

MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator; Myers, 1962) as the index most promising in this regard. Despite misgivings about the validity of the MBTI (Carlson, 1985) or the predictiveness of personality tests of compatibility in mentoring (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newman, 1984), we agreed to administer the MBTI to already established pairs.

Procedures for Meetings and Data Collection

We were able, with FIPSE funds, to pay mentors at a rate of $2,500 per academic year. FIPSE did not agree to pay stipends to new faculty (whose initial complaints of busyness and poverty were linked to expectations of compensation akin to that awarded to mentors), supposing that provision of mentors was sufficient reward for mentees. In turn, both mentors and mentees agreed to four specific conditions of participation: (a) To meet in mentor-mentee meetings at least weekly for an academic year; (b) to attend monthly meetings of all project pairs; (c) to keep regular records of their pair meetings; and (d) to submit to weekly or biweekly observations and surveys conducted by the project directors.

Our first contact with pairs was in individual interviews during which we asked them about prior experiences with mentoring, about their notions of what good mentors offered mentees, and about the strengths and needs that they brought to the project. We used participants' expectations of mentoring activities and a review of the literature to devise a simple checklist that pair members could use to record the content of pair meetings (Appendix I). Pair members were given small notebooks filled with such pages and asked to spend a minute or two checking topics that were discussed and entering notes about other reflections. Except for the content areas suggested by the checklist and discussions during group meetings (following "mini workshops" on teaching skills and on scholarly productivity and during disclosures by pairs to the group about the nature of their interaction styles), mentors and mentees received no directives on how to proceed.

Appendix II shows the format of a monthly meeting for project pairs. It also depicts the kinds of discussion topics planned for a meeting that helped orient new mentor-mentee pairs. Other monthly meetings included variations on the same two themes: they provided some structured materials for reflection (e.g., improving teaching skills; finding time for scholarly writing), and they encouraged the mentoring pairs to share experiences with each other.

In order to prod pairs to meet regularly and to record the process of mentoring as directly as possible, we visited individuals or pairs on a

weekly or biweekly schedule. Appendix III duplicates the data sheet that we used for making ratings and eliciting judgments from mentees and mentors. For the first two weeks of observations, we made visits jointly, but did ratings independently. After the visits, we discussed differences in our ratings and notes so as to produce more reliable recordings.

At the end of project year one, we held a conference for participants, for other interested faculty and administrators from our campus, and for faculty developers from neighboring campuses. Appendix IV depicts the program announcement for that conference. The purposes of the conference included publicizing the results of our project.

Beginning Assumptions

Our approach and even our results were influenced by our beginning assumptions:

- We felt strongly that we did not know what constituted good mentoring (thus, our reluctance to provide much direction), but we hoped to observe it in progress, perhaps in a variety of forms;
- We suspected that some successes in mentoring would occur quickly (e.g., collegial support; intellectual stimulation) and some would appear slowly (e.g., finding an effective balance between teaching and research);
- Given the precedents in the literature on mentoring, we expected that pairing mentors and mentees arbitrarily (even across traditional boundaries of discipline, gender, and seniority) would work as well as any other scheme (and offer advantages to a campus like ours where traditional pairs could be impractical);
- We planned to define project success in a variety of dimensions, including perpetuation of the project beyond the FIPSE funding period; specifically, we hoped to seed a process of expansion in which both mentors and mentees would help mentor succeeding crops of new faculty.

Results

Involvement of Participants

The pairings worked well. Of the 14 pairs (and 28 participants) recruited, only one mentee dropped out (and was quickly replaced), and only one pair failed to meet regularly or to evidence satisfaction and observable benefits. This single "failed" pair, curiously, was one of the few

pairs in which we were influenced by requests of the two people to let them work together; subsequently, they reported a dislike for each other. Toward the end of the project, however, they did meet regularly and they claimed a belated sense of appreciation for benefits derived from the project. With this exception, pairs met weekly almost without fail and they invariably attended monthly group meetings.

Initial Skepticism of Participants

As the project began, pair members expressed reservations that seemed to imperil it. This readily expressed skepticism took several typical forms for participants: (a) they felt initially uncomfortable with arbitrary pairings, in part because prior experiences with mentors had occurred gradually and voluntarily; (b) mentors, realizing that in traditional mentoring, a mentor's role remains unannounced for much of the relationship, reported feeling presumptuous about assuming an announced role as expert (mentees, incidentally, expressed no concerns in this regard); (c) pair members matched across disciplines assumed that neither person would have many useful commonalities with the other; (d) people worried about the time involved in participating in this project; (e) a few participants fretted over privacy and confidentiality in regard to public identification of mentees as needy faculty who could not cope on their own; and (f) several mentees expressed discomfort at the apparent nonreciprocity of the relationship – that they would take, but be unable to give in return.

By the end of project year one, all these reservations had disappeared; in fact, by midterm of the first semester of participation, skepticism had diminished beneath the level of impeding the project. Thus, as they finished year one, for example, all pairs expressed a wish that they had spent more, not less, time together as a pair and with the group of mentoring pairs. And once pairs were firmly established, they routinely volunteered other information that belied their initial skepticism: they readily admitted that arbitrary pairings worked well, that pairings across disciplines produced few, if any, deficits (although they did require extra work from mentors, such as learning the norms and politics of the mentee's department), and that frequent visits by the project directors were invaluable and appreciated prods to establish strong social bonds between pair members. It was also clear that mentors perceived the relationship as inherently reciprocal and a source of significant personal and professional benefit to themselves.

Diversity and Commonality of Interactive Styles

As predicted, mentor-protege pairs showed a remarkable diversity of interaction styles. One pair, for the first semester, limited their interactions to the single topic of manuscript writing and editing. When it became apparent that the mentor, a relatively young and productive writer, could help the mentee get publishing under way, she insisted that the mentor do little else but help her with her manuscripts. Eventually, as she grew more relaxed and trusting in the relationship, she began to solicit advice and support in other areas.

About half the pairs confined first-semester interactions to relatively narrow topics, most often focusing on preparing for retention/tenure/promotion (R/T/P) evaluations. These groups, too, showed a broadening of interests as they proceeded.

Diversity in interactive patterns could be seen most clearly in the settings pairs chose for their meetings (some met only in offices, some only at lunch, some in varying locations) and styles (some mentors were directive, some non-directive). Pairs showed surprise, during monthly meetings, at discovering that other pairs operated differently. They saw that a few mentors were impressively active in taking mentees to resources on campus (e.g., the computer laboratory; the special collections room of the library) and in modeling adaptive behaviors for new faculty (e.g., inviting a mentee to the mentor's class and demonstrating teaching strategies that could be transferred to the mentee's classroom). Thereafter, other pairs resolved to adopt similar activities. Clearly, the monthly group meetings served to boost morale and to educate pairs on alternative approaches to mentoring.

Despite the diversity just described, mentoring pairs showed many commonalities. Among these was a tendency to discuss the same concerns in weekly meetings. Appendix V rank orders the most commonly discussed topics in these meetings to give a sense of the content of mentoring interactions. Concerns with publishing and teaching remained paramount over semesters. The same held true for worries about surviving the R/T/P process and about coping with departmental politics. In a survey of mentoring activities at a campus with a clearer emphasis on teaching, incidentally, pairs most frequently talked about teaching (Holmes, 1988).

Only one real surprise emerged in our data. In initial interviews with prospective mentees and mentors, we got the sense that a priority would be helping mentees find a balance between personal and professional lives. In actual practice, "balance" was discussed infrequently, seemingly because pair members saw it as an unrealistic goal in the short run.

Monthly Group Meetings

These, too, were met with skepticism initially. Nearly everyone claimed to be too busy for the monthly meetings of all mentoring pairs. And when the sole time at which everyone could meet was established as first Wednesdays at 8:00 a.m., complaints intensified.

But group meetings tended to be fun and, eventually, were appreciated. As we have already seen, these were the occasions for mentoring pairs to learn new approaches from other pairs. Equally important, group meetings provided support and cohesion. All but a few participants, mentees *and* mentors, reported that the group meetings were the first time they had felt "like a real part of the campus." This feeling was clearly cherished by project members.

Appendix II, above, shows another component of monthly meetings. As project directors, we typically structured the agenda to elicit discussion on relevant topics. In some meetings, we added "mini workshops" on topics such as teaching skills and scholarly productivity. These, at the least, provoked pairs into thinking about strategies for changing habits and attitudes germane to these vital activities. Four mentees during the first year evidenced specific changes resulting from these prods, even though such changes may typically occur more gradually (Boice, 1988).

Occasionally, group meetings became mired in complaints about the university and its administrators. Four things struck us as curious about these episodes: first, the complainers, when asked later to reflect on the situation claimed that they needed an arena in which to vent frustrations and that the group meetings were their only outlet. Second, the digressions into complaints were always initiated by a few of the mentors. They, clearly, felt more frustration than mentees did about the campus culture. Third, these mentors saw no conflict between their roles as mentors and their tendency to steer group meetings away from constructive discussions. They responded, when asked later, that mentees needed to know the painful realities of life on campus. These same mentors, incidentally, did not evidence similar leanings when meeting individually with mentees. Fourth, mentees reported a strong dislike for these complaint episodes and reacted to them by becoming depressed.

After observing these episodes for a semester, we decided to work at curtailing them. Except for momentary flashes of annoyance from the mentors who were gently asked to get back "on track," this approach worked nicely.

Visits to Pair Members

Visits to mentoring pairs were at once the most difficult and the most rewarding aspect of the project. The difficulty did not arise with regard to the time required for visits; with both of us making these 5- to 10-minute visits to the offices and classrooms of mentees and mentors, observations rarely took more than two-and-a-half hours a week. Instead, the awkwardness came in occasional displays of busyness by participants. Eventually, we discovered that participants' reluctance owed to more than heavy workloads. Mentors and mentees saw our visits (during which conversations typically covered little more than the rating sheets shown in Appendix III) as prods for pairs to meet regularly.

Some pair members, we learned later, felt initial resentment about being pushed to meet during periods when they would have preferred to put off the project for a few weeks. At the same time, some mentors felt annoyed about having been paired with a mentee who acted too busy for weekly pair meetings. (Indeed, we noticed that the neediest mentees were the most reluctant to invest the time and to form pair-bonds in this project.)

But by the end of project year one, when all pairs had established persistent records of meeting regularly, every participant volunteered a changed opinion about our weekly and biweekly visits. Without our visits and prods, they agreed, pair-bonds would have been delayed at best. In fact, related observations of informal but arbitrarily formed mentor--mentee pairings on our campus confirmed this prediction. While these four informal pairs began with apparent enthusiasm and sincerity, they met no more than three times during the academic year. Moreover, none of the mentees in these pairs could point to any lasting benefits of having found a mentor except a few brief and friendly conversations.

Visits to the offices and classrooms of participants also produced other benefits. They allowed us to chart mentees' and mentors' perceptions of the enthusiasm, helpfulness, and supportiveness experienced throughout the year. With the exception of the single "failed" pair mentioned earlier, these ratings started at moderate to moderately high levels, climbed to high levels, and remained high throughout the remaining two-thirds of recordings. The same visits and rating sheets (Appendix III) also allowed us to check the teaching performance of mentees. Where we discerned problems, we communicated these to both mentees and mentors with an eye toward encouraging pairs to work on improvement.

Visits to participants were, finally, an opportunity to quell participants' ambivalence. Mentors, as we saw earlier, typically reported

feeling awkward about assuming the formal role of mentor. They reminded us that mentoring pairs traditionally form without explicit titles, and felt that calling oneself a "mentor" seemed pretentious. When we were able to point out that none of this bothered mentees, mentors were able to forget this concern.

Three mentoring pairs, to cite a second example of our role as counselors, got stuck in another unexpected impasse. So long as they filled initial meetings with enthusiastic discussions of career-related concerns (specifically those listed in Appendix V), they felt content. But when they ran out of formal business, they felt stuck, almost as though their mentoring work were complete. "What should we do next?" they asked us. We realized, a bit sheepishly, that we had failed to coach pairs to include small talk as a regular and important part of pair meetings. Accordingly, we also began to emphasize the importance of persisting in pair meetings just for the sake of regular contact and social support – even when nothing urgent happened. These belated interventions worked nicely and quickly.

Thus, we came to see the need to restore some of the more traditional qualities of informal pairings to our project. Good mentoring requires an optimal balance of both "instrumental" and "socioemotional" components.

Benefits to Mentees and Mentors

Perhaps the most useful finding was that pairings worked equally well within or across traditional boundaries of mentoring new faculty. That is, mentors evidenced the same high level of effectiveness whether they were senior or relatively junior, same or opposite sex of the mentee, same or different discipline as the mentee, or same or different ethnicity as the mentee.

Success of pairs was judged on several dimensions: (a) regularity of pair meetings; (b) reported satisfaction of participants; (c) reported specific benefits of participating in regard to the dimensions listed in Appendix I; and (d) observed benefits in terms of the same dimensions.

Appendix VI illustrates one aspect of those results, based on a separate survey of mentees and mentors at the end of project year one. Participants found emotional support and advice about academic politics the two most helpful aspects of mentoring. They found the intellectual rewards of pairing and the combined resistance and passivity of mentees the most surprising experiences of participating. They wished they had met more often. And they thought they excelled in sharing respect, friendship, support, and advice.

One result specific to mentors alone is not shown in Appendix VI. These participants consistently reported delight in rediscovering that mentoring is much more than just altruism. They felt that they benefitted at least as much as mentees from participating, chiefly in such areas as refocusing on their careers, finding new friendship, and formulating new plans to revitalize their own teaching and scholarship. Holmes (1988) reports similar benefits for mentors of new faculty at another regional campus.

Evidence About Ways to Pair Mentees

A strong concern when we started was how to pair mentors and mentees. Although we matched mentors and mentees with some subjective sense of their compatibility, we worried about establishing pairs that might work counterproductively. Because this was a well-publicized project on campus, explosive pairings could have undermined our goals of building this beginning into a larger, self-perpetuating process.

But as we have already seen, all pairs but one worked compatibly and productively. The single failure was quiet, and, in the end, restarted itself in more cooperative fashion. In our view, and in that of the participating pairs, the single most important reason that pairs worked was that the format pushed them to meet regularly, despite their initial skepticism and busyness.

What about other explanations? Is it possible, even though both authors are psychologists, that we matched people well using intuitive judgments? The results of administering a personality test (the MBTI) to already paired members give some support to this notion. All but a few of the participants showed one of two profiles (ENTJ or ENFP), suggesting that this superficially heterogeneous group was similar in some qualities of personality. We did not, incidentally, pick participants with our own personality profiles (both INTJ).

Perhaps the final word on pairing should go to the participants who experienced partnerships for a year. Appendix VI lists their estimates of the qualities of good mentoring (e.g., investment in time, trust, and emotional support) and the qualities both people should possess to work together well (e.g., trust and motivation to meet). Curiously, those pairs who were matched across traditional boundaries such as discipline concluded that opposites work best together; similarly, those paired within traditional bounds felt certain that similars work best.

Concluding Reflections

In sum, this mentoring project worked far better than we anticipated. Once under way, pairs had fun and demonstrated obvious benefits from the interactions. The monthly group meetings were well attended, we think, because participants had a generally enjoyable and stimulating time.

Moreover, as project year two (now ongoing) got under way, we saw other positive outcomes. Several of the former mentees assumed roles as mentors for even newer new faculty. And all but one of the mentors showed initial promise of continuing in that role, despite no longer being paid. Equally important, three of the six faculty developers from neighboring campuses had, by the end of project year one, already established the beginnings of mentoring projects for their own new faculty.

We concluded the first year with a single reservation about the way the project had gone. We, along with several participants, felt that we should have provided more encouragement and structure for mentors as visitors to mentees' classrooms. In project year two, we are working toward training mentors as coaches and evaluators who provide nurturant feedback and useful modeling for colleagues new to teaching.

References

Alleman, E., Cochran, J., Doverspike, J., & Newman, I. (1984). Enriching mentoring relationships. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62,* 329-332.

Austin, A. E., & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Boice, R. (1988). Helping faculty meet new pressures for scholarly writing. In J. Kurfiss, L. Hilsen, S. Kahn, M.D. Sorcinelli, & R.G. Tiberius (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy, 7,* 135-148.

Brookes, M. C. T., & German, K. L. (1983). *Meeting the challenges: Developing faculty careers.* Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Carlson, J. G. (1985). Recent assessment of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 356-365.

Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holmes, S. K. (1988). New faculty mentoring: Benefits to the mentor. *Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 6,* 17-20.

Kolbert, E. (1987, April 12). Getting new teachers off on the right foot. *New York Times* (Section 12), pp. 22-26.

Levinson, D. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York: Knopf.

Merriam, S. B., Thomas, T. K., & Zeph, C. P. (1987). Mentoring in higher education: What we know now. *Review of Higher Education, 11,* 199-210.

Myers, I. B. (1962). *Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Schuster, J. H., & Bowen, H. R. (1985, September/October). The faculty at risk. *Change,* pp. 13-21.

Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the beginning: The concerns and needs of new faculty. In J. Kurfiss, L. Hilsen, L. Mortensen, &E. Wadsworth (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy, 6,* 41-55.

Wylie, N. R. (1985). *Third year renewal proposal to FIPSE.*

Appendix I

Checklist and Note Sheet Filled Out Individually by Mentors and Mentees After Each Interaction

Mentoring Project

Name_____ Location_____

Date_____ Duration_____

Content of conversation/discussion (check all that apply)
_ (a) Academic politics
_ (b) Teaching
_ (c) Research/scholarship/publication
_ (d) Career planning
_ (e) Personal problems
_ (f) Time management
_ (g) R/T/P process
_ (h) Role in service to department
_ (i) Role in service to university
_ (j) Professional ethics, values, etc.
_ (k) Relations with colleagues
_ (l) Development of professional networks
_ (m) Balance of personal and professional commitments
_ (n) Community service
_ (o) Other (describe):_____

Notes: Please briefly elaborate on any observations, feelings, critical incidents, etc., that seem important.

Appendix II

Handout Used in a Monthly Group Meeting of Mentoring Pairs

Orientation Meeting*

Mentors Helping New Faculty Adjust and Prosper at CSULB Center for Faculty Development

Bob Boice and Jim Turner

A. Cast of Characters (began first semester): Collegial Pairs [names omitted here]

__ (Public Policy & Adminis.) & __ (Engineering & Industrial Technology)
__ (Educational Psychology & Admin.) & __ (Educ. Psychology & Admin.)
__ (Economics) & __ (Economics)
__ (Sociology) & __ (Theatre Arts)
__ (Psychology) & __ (Psychology/Women's Studies)

Collegial pairs beginning second semester

__ (Social Work) & __ (Social Work)
__ (Criminal Justice/Voc. Educ.) & __ (Voc. Educ./Educ. Psych. & Admin.)
__ (Women's Studies/English) & __ (English)
__ (Counseling Center) & __ (Educational Psychology & Administration)
__ (Comparative Literature) & __ (Library)
__ (Psychology) & __ (Chemistry)
__ (Recreation & Leisure Studies) & __ (Electrical Engineering)
__ (Center for Faculty Development) & __ (Theatre Arts)
__ (Center for Faculty Development) & __ (Home Economics)

Project Consultants from Other Campuses

Patricia Beyer (Cal State Los Angeles)
James Cooper (Cal State Dominguez Hills)
Joseph Cuseo (Marymount Palos Verdes College)
Tyrone Lavery (Long Beach City College)
Brennis Lucero-Wagoner (Cal State Northridge)

*Outline from the second orientation meeting of participants in a FIPSE-funded project on mentoring for new faculty, held February 3, 1988, California State University, Long Beach.

B. Overview of Project Plans

1. Abstract from the FIPSE Grant:
   Like many other comprehensive universities, California State University, Long Beach is recently hiring new faculty after a long period of retrenchment. Our preliminary project with new faculty has specified a general passivity of faculty toward mentoring and serious problems for the many new faculty who go unmentored. We propose a proactive program of establishing mentoring relationships in ways that 1) bring new faculty together in workshops with mentors, 2) encourage sustained pairings in formats including coteaching, 3) permit systematic documentation of the varieties and effects of mentoring, and 4) generate practical materials for exporting mentoring programs to other campuses.
2. Essential goals:
   a. create visible, successful mentoring pairs at a campus where many new faculty complain of social isolation and intellectual understimulation
   b. create cross-generational mentoring patterns beginning with proteges (or mentorees) of present group
   c. help new faculty at CSULB survive in happy, successful fashion
   d. export CSULB's mentoring program(s) to neighboring campuses
   e. study the mentoring process over the long run
3. Project-related tasks and expectations:
   a. weekly meetings between colleague-pairs (initiated by mentor where necessary; typically held in site and at time favoring convenience of protegé) for at least one academic year
   b. occasional visits by both pair members to each other's classes with brief discussion/feedback soon afterward
   c. monthly attendance at group meetings of protegés and mentors
   d. completion of brief checklist following each pair meeting (by both pair members)
   e. attendance at year-end conference where results/experiences of the project are shared in systematic fashion
   f. allowing project directors (Bob Boice and Jim Turner) and consultants/observers from other campuses (Jim Cooper, Joe Cuseo, Ty Lavery) to observe some instances of pair meetings, to sample portions of both pair members in classrooms, and to briefly survey individual participants about ongoing experiences

g. allowing project directors to collate and analyze information gleaned (including checklists mentioned above) from project and to prepare those data (while protecting anonymity of project participants) for public consumption including publication
h. One-time only completion of a personality inventory (the MBTI), carried out at the prodding of the funding agency

C. Group Discussion of Qualities Essential to Mentoring Interactions

1. Reservations about artificially constituted pairs, etc.; about running out of things to discuss; about having to meet too often
2. Problems with busyness
3. Speculations about the dimensions of mentoring (including the tentative list that follows):
   a. academic politics
   b. teaching
   c. research/scholarship/publication
   d. career planning
   e. personal problems
   f. time management
   g. RTP process
   h. role in service to department
   i. role in service to university
   j. professional ethics, values, etc.
   k. relations with colleagues
   l. development of professional networks
   m. balance of personal and professional commitments
   n. community service
   o. other
4. Group sharing of previous experiences as mentors and/or protegés
5. Critical incidents format for generating ideas on how mentors and mentorees might function (including this suggested list):
   a. The new faculty member is approached by a student who accuses another faculty member of sexual harassment
   b. A new faculty member experiences panic attacks before entering classrooms
   c. A mentor functions well until insisting that the protegé do things just as the mentor does them
   d. A new faculty member cannot get clear information about RTP requirements

e. One of the pair members wants to break off the relationship, but doesn't want to create bad feelings or feel guilty about quitting the project
f. The mentor/protegé relationship does not develop over time into one of mutual respect and trust (e.g., the mentor persists in treating the protegé as a naive beginner and invokes his/her own seniority and status)

Appendix III

Data Sheet Used by Observers When Visiting Mentees and/or Mentors

Name_____ Loc_____ Date & time_____ Observer____

Mentoring Project

Mentoring Pairs

Comfort/friendliness_____

Humor (frequency)_____

Advice seeking (frequency)_____

Advice giving (frequency)_____

On track/productive_____

Distractions/intrusions (frequency)_____

Genuineness/sensitivity_____

Individual Interview with Mentor and Protege

Have mentor and protegé met within the last week? Yes _ No _
Describe:_____

Have mentor and protegé communicated by phone in last week?
Yes_____ _____

Dissatisfied										*Satisfied*
Enthusiasm for the Project										
own	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
partner's	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Usefulness of Information and Practical Knowledge Provided
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Level of Social Support and Encouragement Provided
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Personal Compatibility of the Participants

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Overall Personal Benefits Derived from Mentoring Relationship

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Classroom Observations

Classroom comfort _ Teacher-student rapport _

Humor (frequency) _ Enthusiasm _

Structure/organization _ Respect for students _

Communication clarity/interest _ Student attentiveness _

Notes: Overall quality of teaching _

Appendix IV

Conference for Faculty Developers of California

Wednesday, May 4, 1988

Sponsored by Center for Faculty Development
California State University, Long Beach

Topic for 1988: Mentoring Programs for New Faculty

Conference Schedule (Soroptimist House, CSU, Long Beach Campus)

8:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Conference attendees as observers of a monthly meeting of participants (i.e., mentors and mentees) in CSULB's mentoring project for new faculty
9:30 - 9:45	Break
9:45 - 10:00	Welcoming comments
10:00 - 10:30	Overview of CSULB's FIPSE-funded project for mentoring
10:30 - 11:30	Attendees as participants (group discussion of mentoring projects planned or ongoing at other campuses and of other faculty development concerns)
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch

For further information and reservation form contact:

Bob Boice or Jim Turner
Center for Faculty Development
California State University, Long Beach 90840
(213) 985-5287

Appendix V

Rank Ordering of Most Common Discussion Topics Recorded by Mentoring Pairs

Ranking 1st sem.	2nd sem.	Discussion Topic
1	1	Research/Scholarship/Publication
2	2	Teaching
3	5	R/T/P Process
4	3	Academic Politics
5	4	Relations with Colleagues
6	9	Time Management
7	6	Other
8	7	Career Planning
9	13	Role in Service to Department
10	8	Personal Problems
11	10	Professional Networks
12	14	Community Service
13	11	Professional Ethics
14	12	Balance of Personal & Professional Lives

Appendix VI

Participants' Survey Responses at End of Project Year 1

Question	*Most Common Replies (Rank Ordered)*
What was most helpful?	1) help with academic politics 2) emotional support 3) help with teaching 4) help with scholarship 5) time management/goal setting
What was most unanticipated?	1) the intellectual rewards of participation 2) resistance and passivity of mentees 3) openness, helpfulness of mentors 4) mentees' needs for concrete help
In retrospect, what would you do differently?	1) meet with pair member more frequently 2) meet regularly, sooner 3) provide/get more interventions
What did your pair do best?	1) found respect and friendship 2) got/gave support and advice
What is the essence of good mentoring?	1) investment in time and trust 2) emotional support and listening 3) mutual benefits
What qualities should be considered for pairings?	1) trust and motivation 2) opposites 3) similarities 4) potential for friendship